



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,687	11/19/2003	Charles Jeff Morgan	20501/553	6600
32847 7590 05/30/2008 THE OLLILA LAW GROUP LLC 2060 BROADWAY SUITE 300 BOULDER, CO 80302			EXAMINER CHARLES, MARCUS	
			ART UNIT 3682	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/30/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10716687	11/19/2003	MORGAN, CHARLES JEFF	20501/553

THE OLLILA LAW GROUP LLC
2060 BROADWAY
SUITE 300
BOULDER, CO 80302

EXAMINER

Marcus Charles

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

3682

20080525

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

This correspondence is a correction to the examiner's answer filed 01-11-2007, correcting section 9 (Grounds of Rejection) of the examiner's answer by including the claims listing in the final rejection.

(10) Response to Argument

Regarding claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-16 and 19-20, appellant argues that the prior art fails to anticipate each element of the claims, in that Lawroski fails to disclose the shaft having a normal belt position set forth in claims 1 and 14. In response, the claims are to a subcombination apparatus, only drawn to a shaft not a belt plus shaft. (2. In appellant's shaft, the normal belt position is merely a straight section (see marked-up fig. 1 below). Lawroski also discloses a shaft (38) having a straight section similar to that of appellant's (see marked-up fig. 1A below). Therefore, this meets the apparatus limitation since the structures are identical. In addition, appellant argues that Lawroski's groove is not angled because it is curved. However, a curved groove is made up of an infinite number of angles. Applicant doesn't state a specific type of angle (i.e. sharp or curve). Therefore, Lawroski's curved grooved meets this limitation (see marked-up fig. 1A below).

/Marcus Charles/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3682